

REMARKS

Reconsideration and allowance of the above-reference application are respectfully requested.

I. STATUS OF THE CLAIMS

Claims 11, 14 and 24 are amended herein.

In view of the above, it is respectfully submitted that claims 11-24 are currently pending and under consideration.

II. REJECTION OF CLAIMS 11, 12, 14-17, and 24 UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 102(B) AS BEING ANTICIPATED OVER TAKEZAWA ET AL. (USP# 4,625,333)

The present invention as recited in claim 11 (as amended herein), for example, relates to an optical communication unit comprising "an optical module to house said light emitting section and said light receiving section" and having "a first converging lens attached to said optical module" and "a second converging lens attached to said optical module." The optical communication unit also comprises "a shielding section to optically shield light between said first converging lens and said second converging lens."

Takezawa discloses a transmission module unit having a light emitting element and a lens confronting the light emitting element and a reception module unit having a light receiving element and a lens confronting the light receiving element. In Fig. 1, Takezawa discloses a receptacle 3, and in Figs. 8 and 9, a connector receptacle body 81, convex lens 61 and 62, and the transmission and reception module units 12 and 13 formed on ceramic substrates 11A and 11B, respectively.

However, the convex lens 61 and 62 of Takezawa are not attached to the receptacle 3 or the connector receptacle body 81, like the first and second converging lens which are attached to the claimed optical module as recited in claim 1 of the present application. Instead, the convex lens 61 and 62 are attached to shells 20 and 22, which along with other ring elements, are provided to hermetical seal the transmission and reception module units 12 and 13 to the substrate 11. Thus, the optical communication device of Takezawa is constructed differently than the claimed optical communication unit of the present application.

Further, the Examiner believes that Takezawa discloses a shielding section to optically shield light between the lenses 61 and 62 in Figs. 5-9. The Examiner believes that shielding

elements 20 and 22 supported by various ring elements, provide shielding between the lenses 61 and 62, and that the connector receptacle body 81 also provides shielding between the lenses 61 and 62.

However, nothing in Takezawa discloses or suggests that the shells 20 and 22 are provided to optically shield light between the convex lens 61 and 62. In fact, Takezawa discloses that the shells 20 and 22 are provided, along with the other ring elements, to seal the transmission module unit 12 and reception module unit 13 (see column 8, lines 6-23). Figs. 8 and 9, for example, show that a portion of the convex lens 61 and 62 are exposed. Thus, the shells 20 and 22 do not shield light between the lens 61 and 62. In regard to the connector receptacle body 81, Takezawa also does not disclose that the connector receptacle body 81 is provided to shield light between the lens 61 and 62.

Therefore, Takezawa does not disclose the features recited in claim 1 of the present application.

Similar to claim 11, claim 14 recites an "optical module...to house said signal transmitting/receiving section," which distinguishes over the cited prior art. Claim 24 recites an "optical module to house the light transceiver section" and having "a first converging lens attached to said optical module" and "a second converging lens attached to said optical module," which distinguish over the cited prior art.

Claim 12, and claims 15-18, 20 and 21 depend from claims 11 and 14, respectively. Therefore, for at least the reasons that claims 11 and 14 distinguish over the cited prior art, it is respectfully submitted that claims 12, 15-18, 20 and 21 also distinguish over the cited prior art.

In view of the above, it is respectfully submitted that the rejection is overcome.

III. REJECTION OF CLAIM 13 UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103(A) AS BEING UNPATENTABLE OVER TAKEZAWA ET AL. AS APPLIED TO CLAIM 11 ABOVE, AND FURTHER IN VIEW OF KOBAYASHI (USP# 5,986,785)

The comments in section II, above, also apply here because claim 13 depends from claim 11. Therefore, for at least the reasons that claim 11 distinguishes over the cited prior art, it is respectfully submitted that claim 13 also distinguishes over the cited prior art.

In view of the above, it is respectfully submitted that the rejection is overcome.

IV. REJECTION OF CLAIMS 19, 22 and 23 UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103(A) AS BEING UNPATENTABLE OVER TAKEZAWA ET AL. AS APPLIED TO CLAIM 14 ABOVE, AND FURTHER IN VIEW OF TSUJI ET AL. (USP# 5,664,035)

The comments in section II, above, also apply here because claims 19, 22 and 23 depend from claim 14. Therefore, for at least the reasons that claim 14 distinguishes over the cited prior art, it is respectfully submitted that claims 19, 22 and 23 also distinguish over the cited prior art.

In view of the above, it is respectfully submitted that the rejection is overcome.

V. CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, it is respectfully submitted that each of the claims patentably distinguishes over the prior art, and therefore defines allowable subject matter. A prompt and favorable reconsideration of the rejection along with an indication of allowability of all pending claims are therefore respectfully requested.

If there are any additional fees associated with filing of this Amendment, please charge the same to our Deposit Account No. 19-3935.

Respectfully submitted,

STAAS & HALSEY LLP

Date: 1-14-03

By: Derrick L. Fields
Derrick L. Fields
Registration No. 50,133

1201 New York Avenue, NW, Suite 700
Washington, D.C. 20005
(202) 434-1500